

## AMERICA TOO GRASPING

### A British View of Amendments to the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

The "Standard" regards the subject as one demanding sober treatment—willing to make reasonable concessions—willing to reject the Convention if radically changed.

LONDON, Dec. 18.—The "Standard," which is the leading ministerial organ, again discusses the Anglo-American situation in relation to the Nicaragua Canal. It again asserts that the amendments to the Hay-Pauncefote Convention, are not acceptable and if the convention is presented to Great Britain so amended it will necessarily be rejected, Great Britain falling back on the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty.

Nevertheless, it seems hoped that the Government will be spared the unenviable alternative, and contends there is not the smallest occasion for any outburst of ill-feeling. The question, it says, ought to be easily susceptible in both countries of sober and rational treatment. It adds:

"For our part we are quite prepared to make all reasonable concessions to the sentiments and interests of the American people, but having full sympathy with their point of view we are entitled to ask them in return to put themselves to some extent in our place."

It contends that not only did Englandmen in 1850 and subsequently think that Great Britain had in no wise obtained the best of the agreement to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, but they have to remember the strategic advantages which the right to fortify the canal would confer on the United States—advantages which the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty aimed to prevent either nation from obtaining at the other's expense.

For these reasons the paper considers that the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty is a compromise which the United States ought to find satisfactory, since Great Britain gets very little out of it and they obtain a great deal. If they are not content Great Britain will have to rely on the former treaty and ask them to give good enough to abide by their terms, and that is a position which is not to be taken. So far as Great Britain is concerned the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty can stand indefinitely, but any suggestions looking for modification by mutual consent will receive the fullest consideration by England.

It should be understood however, that Great Britain cannot be expected to abandon the treaty, nor is it reasonable to expect her to give up all her rights under it without any compensation. For the claims and possible difficulties in Central America in 1850, which by now might have been of incalculable value. It should not be forgotten that the Washington diplomatist to suggest a suitable equivalent for the surrender of British privileges.

The "Standard" concludes its editorial by declaring the fact that the revised treaty in the Senate has revived anti-English manifestations, which it had hoped were extinct. It claims that the revised treaty has long been forgotten here, and that all Englishmen are anxious, and, as it believes, a large proportion of Americans are, to develop the canal, and that mutual reliance and assistance which many recent events have warranted both may be imperative. It says it would be a pity if a salutary anxiety to realize the latest dream of American expansion.

## THE MINISTRY SUSTAINED.

### A Hostile Amendment to the Amnesty Bill Defeated.

PARIS, Dec. 17.—The Government won another victory in the Chamber of Deputies today in connection with the amnesty bill. M. Vazeille proposed an amendment to the measure excluding from amnesty those guilty of crimes committed in connection with the Dreyfus case. Prime Minister Waldeck-Rousseau opposed the amendment. He declared that it would reopen the whole Dreyfus case, which would be an unpardonable mistake. He said he would treat the matter as a question of confidence in the Government, and which the Ministry would stand or fall. The amendment was rejected by a vote of 341 to 99.

## NO NEW PLAGUE CASES.

### One Death Reported From the King William Town District.

CAPE TOWN, Dec. 17.—A woman has died from the plague, in the King William Town district. No fresh cases have been reported. There is now only one case under treatment, and the quarantine has been relaxed.

The sentences imposed by the court at Coleridge in the cases of the men convicted of treason, were read as follows: Van Rensburg was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment and to pay a fine of £500. Roux was sentenced to two years and six months' imprisonment, to pay a fine of £500, and to be kept in prison for one year and six months; Fowler to one year and six months; and to pay a fine of £500, and to be kept in prison for one year and six months.

## THE WRECK OF THE GNEISENAU

### Suicide of the Captain When He Saw His Vessel Was Lost.

MADRID, Dec. 17.—The German schooner Gneisenau, which sank at the mouth of the harbor of Malaga yesterday, is rapidly breaking up.

It is reported that the commander of the Gneisenau committed suicide when he saw that his ship and crew could not be saved. Among the officers who were saved is one of the name of Bernadot, who is a nephew of Count von Burelow, the imperial chamberlain.

## BRITISH TRADE DECLINING.

### England in Fear of American and German Competition.

LONDON, Dec. 15.—The "Daily Mail" and the "Daily Express" concurrently began this morning a series of articles based on special enquiries dealing with the question of the decline of British trade. Each article is based on the fact that despite the apparent prosperity and fullness of orders, Great Britain is not holding her former position of supremacy, but is being pushed out, primarily by the United States and secondly by Germany.

## East of the River.

### London, Dec. 18.—The Pekin correspondent of the "Morning Post" says that Li Hung Chang has suffered with a slight fever for the past three days. Dr. Veide, surgeon of the German Legation, has visited him.

## Flynn's Business College, 8th and K.

Business, shorthand, typewriting—\$15 a year.

## ACCEPTABLE TO AMERICA.

### Mr. Conger Instructed to Agree to England's Latest Suggestion.

Secretary Hay had a conference with the President yesterday afternoon about the status of the negotiations at Pekin and of returning to the State Department sent instructions to Minister Conger, which, it is believed, will remove any cause of further delay in the signing of the preliminary agreement containing the conditions with which the Chinese Government must comply. The conference was based on a despatch from Mr. Conger received yesterday, in which he explained the nature of the amendments suggested by Sir Ernest Satow, the British Minister.

## THE CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY.

### It was shown by Mr. Conger's message that the suggested changes are immaterial and that there is no real ground for the reports that negotiations were severely jeopardized by Great Britain. One of the British proposals was that the expression that the conditions contained in the preliminary agreement were "irrevocable" should be modified. The other was that a clause explaining why the Powers demanded the punishment of Chinese officials should be inserted in the agreement.

As these suggestions were regarded by this Government as not affecting the principles of the conditions, they are entirely acceptable. Mr. Conger had been told in his general instructions that reasonable modifications would not be objectionable to the United States, and that there might be no further delay or any opportunity for misunderstanding, he was informed in the instructions to agree to the amendments, and that he was authorized to accept the British suggestions.

## TIBET AFTER AN OPEN DOOR.

### Overtures Said to Have Been Made to England and Russia.

VANCOUVER, B. C., Dec. 17.—The Rev. Robert Jaffray, head of the American Chinese mission in South China, who has returned to the States for his health, after labor in the mission field, states that he is in possession of information from an excellent source to the effect that the British Government is considering the Tibet, taking advantage of the situation of China, to throw off the yoke, and preferring to be a vassal of Russia or Great Britain has made overtures to both those countries and has been refused.

## THE POPE'S TEMPORAL POWER.

### Leo's Lament Over the Loss of the Pontiff's Sovereignty.

ROME, Dec. 17.—The Pope's allusion at the secret consistory today contained besides an expression of thankfulness to God for sparing him to complete the Holy Year, the customary condemnation of Italian Government's loss of sovereignty, his Holiness said:

"Truly it is a calamity for us that force has deprived the Pontiff of his jurisdiction over the States. His Holiness is now under the power of other men. The Pope is entirely subject to their caprices. The restoration of his sovereignty, which is bound up with his freedom, his justice, and his power, is the duty of all men. The Pope is now under the power of other men. The Pope is entirely subject to their caprices. The restoration of his sovereignty, which is bound up with his freedom, his justice, and his power, is the duty of all men."

## DOCK LABORERS STRIKE.

### Ships Compelled to Abandon Their Cargo at Antwerp.

ANTWERP, Dec. 17.—A strike which had been brewing for some time today broke out from conflict between the ship owners and the dock laborers regarding Sunday and night work. The men wanted double pay for this work, but the ship owners, including the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg American Line, refused to grant more than 10 per cent extra. The Dock Workers' Union and the Mutual Dock Workers' Association agreed to a strike for several days.

## COAL MINERS GO OUT.

### Several Grievances Cause a Strike in the Anthracite Region.

WILKESBARRE, Pa., Dec. 17.—The employees of the Kingston Coal Company went on strike this afternoon and all four of the mines at Edwinstown are idle. Those at Gaylord were allowed to work until next Saturday, and if the strike is not ended then will join their fellow-workmen. It is the most serious strike since the ending of the general strike recently, and as the questions involved are of a serious nature, it may follow suit. The strikers number 1,500.

## ENROLLING THE CHOCTAWS.

### The Dawes Commission Taking Evidence in Mississippi.

NEW ORLEANS, Dec. 17.—The Dawes Indian Commission, just from the Indian Territory, began its session in Hattiesburg, Miss., today. The object of the Hattiesburg sitting is to enroll the Mississippi Choctaw Indians. This portion of the tribe remained behind in Mississippi when the main portion of the tribe went to the Indian Territory to reside. Under the Dawes law rights in the Indian Territory and the present enrollment is being made in order to allot the lands to the Choctaws. It will be required to take all the evidence and to determine which of the Choctaws in Louisiana and Mississippi are entitled to a share of the Choctaw fund. The Choctaws who refused to leave their homes when the great exodus to the Indian Territory began, are now being enrolled in the counties of Mississippi and St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana. They live in villages apart from the whites, and there has been little intermixture of the bloods.

## SECRET TO BE OBSERVED.

### Investigation of Charges Against Cuban Nationalist Officials.

SANTIAGO DE CUBA, Dec. 17.—"La Republica," an official published an article stating that Senator Pignero, Secretary of the Commission that is enquiring into the charges against the municipal authorities, had up to that time, discovered nothing of an incriminating nature. Today the "Independencia" publishes a disclaimer, stating that nothing regarding the investigation will be made public until the commission finishes its work.

## Best Boards Only—We sell sound.

Best boards at \$1.25 per 100 sq. ft. for fence, sheds, etc., and all kinds of building. Also call for F. Libby & Co., at 2th & N. Y. ave.

## TO VOTE ON THE TREATY

### The Senate Decides to Act on Thursday Afternoon.

The Programme Agreed Upon to Executive Session Yesterday—The Debate on the Hay-Pauncefote Convention Continues—Arguments by Senators Money and Mason.

At 3 o'clock Thursday afternoon the Senate will begin voting on the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty and the amendments now pending and these that may be offered in an executive session yesterday this programme was agreed upon without the formality of a vote. Both Houses of Congress will adjourn Friday night January 3. The two amendments striking out Article III, which invites the adherence of other Powers and declares that the pending convention "supersedes" the Clayton-Bulwer compact, will be dropped, and those in charge of the treaty are confident that all other proposed changes will be defeated by a majority of ten or twelve votes. They say that there will be at least 64 in favor of the treaty, and that the amendments will be rejected by a majority of more than two-thirds.

After the agreement yesterday Mr. Butler gave notice that hereafter he would object to any unanimous consent fixing a day for a vote on any important subject before the Senate. He declared that such agreements were likely to lessen the interest of Senators in the subjects under discussion, and pointed to the fact that the knowledge that an agreement would be reached on the treaty yesterday without opposition had caused the Chamber to be emptied during executive session, and compelled Mr. Money to speak practically to empty benches, there being, Mr. Butler said, only three Republican Senators in the Chamber, while Mr. Money was addressing the Senate on a question of policy for which the Republican party was responsible.

## IN EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The discussion of the treaty yesterday in executive session was participated in only by Senators Money and Mason. They were permitted to make their speeches without interruption. Mr. Money, in the outset, declared it to be his desire to first defeat the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and then to specific enactment to repeal the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. He said that the Senate ought to vote on the treaty at once, and that he would be glad to see it passed.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a surrender of the United States to Great Britain in respect to the transit route, that such a surrender would be a disgrace to the United States, and that he would be glad to see it rejected.

Mr. Money read at great length from the speech of Stephen A. Douglas in the United States Senate, delivered only a few years ago, in which he declared that the United States ought to have a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty had been negotiated. Mr. Douglas was the only man in the Senate who made any active opposition to the treaty. He said that the treaty was a